



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
--------------------	-------------	-----------------------	---------------------

09/138,817 08/21/98 LIU

F 003057.P003D

EXAMINER

LM02/0421

BLAKELEY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN  
12400 WILSHIRE BLVD  
7TH FLOOR  
LOS ANGELES CA 90025

ART UNIT PCT CASE NUMBER

4

DATE MAILED: 2787

04/21/00

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.  
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

OFFICE ACTION SUMMARY

☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 8-21-98

☐ This action is FINAL.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 D.C. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire three month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 1 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some\* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) \_\_\_\_\_

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of Reference Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

4

1. This action is in response to the application filed on August 21, 1998. Claim 1 is pending. Claims 2-33 have been canceled as requested in the Preliminary Amendment.
2. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. The current title is imprecise.
3. The non-statutory double patenting rejection, whether obviousness-type or non-obviousness-type, is based on a judicially established doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in a statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent. In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); In re Van Ornam, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); and In re Goodman, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR § 1.321(b) and (c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a non-statutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR § 1.78(d).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

4. Claim 1 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claim 1 of U.S. patent no. 5,802,398. Although the conflicting

claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they are directed to substantially the same invention where the disk drive corresponds to the first storage device and the tape drive corresponds to the second storage device. The subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the patent and is covered by the patent since the patent and the application are claiming common subject matter. Furthermore, there is no apparent reason why applicant was prevented from presenting claims corresponding to those of the instant application during prosecution of the application which matured into a patent. In *Re Schneller*, 397 F.2d 350, 158 USPQ 210 (CCPA 1968). See also MPEP § 804.

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 USC § 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 USC 103, the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of potential 35 USC 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 USC 103.

7. The following is a quotation of 35 USC 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that

the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

8. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Klashka et al, U.S. Patent 4,803,623.

Per claim 1:

A) Klashka et al teach the following claimed items:

1. an interface for interfacing a first and a second storage device and coupled with the storage devices with Universal Peripheral Controller 209 and Adapters 212 of figure 2 and at column 5, lines 46-64;
2. first indicator means indicating whether the first storage device is executing a command with the address channel busy indication and the address channel ACK indication at column 12, lines 34-59; and
3. second indicator means indicating whether the second storage device is receiving information over the interface with the data channel busy indication, with figures 5A and 7Q, at column 5, lines 32-34, at column 7, lines 1-14, 30-36 and 48-51 and at column 20, lines 37-65.

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Serial Number 09/138,817  
Art Unit 2787

- 5 -

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dennis M. Butler whose telephone number is (703) 305-9663. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9:30 AM to 6:00 PM.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Dennis M. Butler  
April 18, 2000

*Dennis M. Butler*  
Dennis M. Butler  
Primary Examiner  
Group 2780